

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

PENNY QUINTEROS,

CASE NO. C19-1402 RSM

Plaintiff,

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION TO ALLOW OVER-LENGTH
RESPONSE**

INNOGAMES, et al.,

Defendants.

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion to Allow Over-length Response.

Dkt. #71. Plaintiff has already filed an approximately 46-page Response to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint. Dkt. #67. Local Civil Rule 7(e)(3) limits her response to a motion to dismiss to twenty-four pages. LCR 7(e)(3). After the fact, Plaintiff requests that the Court excuse her over-length response. Dkt. #71. Plaintiff relies on the fact that she is proceeding pro se and asserts that she lacks the ability to determine which arguments respond substantively to Defendants' Motion and which were merely tangential. *Id.* at 2. Plaintiff also believes that she lacks the ability to make legal arguments concisely. *Id.*

Motions for over-length briefs are disfavored under the Local Civil Rules: “Motions seeking approval to file an over-length motion or brief are disfavored but may be filed subject to” several procedural requirements. LCR 7(f). Chief among the procedural requirements, “[t]he

1 motion shall be filed as soon as possible but no later than three days before the underlying motion
2 or brief is due.” LCR 7(f)(1).

3 Here, Plaintiff’s request to file an over-length brief was made after she had already filed
4 an over-length response, but more than three days before her response is actually due.
5 Defendants’ motion to dismiss was filed on September 14, 2020 and noted for October 9, 2020.
6 Dkt. #64. This made Plaintiff’s response due no later than October 5, 2020. LCR 7(d)(3).
7 Plaintiff filed her over-length response on September 25, 2020 and provides no explanation as to
8 why she could not use the additional ten days available to her to refine and revise her over-length
9 brief in order to comply with this Court’s page limits. In fact, encouraging parties to focus on
10 the most relevant and meritorious facts and arguments is a significant purpose of the Court’s page
11 limits. This is equally true of pro se parties. Plaintiff’s pro se status and her concern over having
12 time to select and concisely present her best legal arguments may well justify a request to extend
13 the deadline for a response. *See Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)*. But that is not the request before the Court
14 at this time. Plaintiff may file an amended response no later than October 5, 2020.

15 Accordingly, having reviewed Plaintiff’s motion and the remainder of the record, the
16 Court hereby finds and ORDERS that Plaintiff’s Motion to Allow Over-length Response (Dkt.
17 #71) is DENIED.

18 Dated this 29th day of September, 2020.

19
20
21
22
23
24


RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE